

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

W

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,115	07/18/2003	John Joseph M. Carrasco	600189-433	4451
61834 DREIER LLP	7590 10/18/	007	EXAM	INER
499 PARK AV	_		LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE	
NEW YORK, NY 10022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Interview Summary	10/623,115	CARRASCO ET AL.6				
. interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mark Fadok	. 3625				
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):						
(1) Mark Fadok	(3)					
(2) Mr. Stephen Scheafer.	(4)	•				
Date of Interview: <u>01 October 2006</u> .						
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant	2)⊠ applicant's representat	ive]				
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No	•				
Claim(s) discussed:	•					
Identification of prior art discussed:						
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached.	g)⊠ was not reached. h)□	] N/A.				
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)						
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGE INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INfrequirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	the last Office action has alrea ER OF ONE MONTH OR THIF NTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM	dy been filed, APPLICANT IS TY DAYS FROM THIS M, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO				
	·					

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Scheafer called to discuss the restriction requirement mailed 9/10/2007. Mr. Scheafer indicated that he had never seen a restriction requirement as outlined in the examiner's restriction requirement and indicated that usually the examiner points to the drawings or embodiments in the specification and indicates items that are restricted to the disclosed embodiments. Mr. Scheafer indicated that having to identify which restricted claims belong to each embodiment would be difficult on his part. This the examiner believes would indicate that Mr. sheafer understands the burden placed on the examiner to examine the restricted claims in the office action mailed 9/10/2007. Mr. Scheafer asked if the provided restriction requirement was a newly sanctioned method by the Office. The examiner noted that the restriction requirement was made based on the examiner's understanding of the practices and procedures found in the MPEP and noted that if the applicant finds fault in the restriction requirement, he should respond in writing at which time a consideration of the arguments will be throughly conducted and a response forwarded in the next office action. The examiner also stated that the applicant must select a grouping even if a traverse in provided. Should the examiner maintain the restriction the examiner instructed Mr. Scheafer that a petition may be made to the Director for further consideration.